

## **Technical Review Discussion with C6 on the April 2010 Draft UIC permit**

### Questions on the Redline of the draft permit submitted by C6

1. Page 9 – Why was the requirement for the computation of reservoir compressibility deleted?
2. Page 9 – Why was the reporting of the pressure build up deleted?
3. Page 11- please provide additional language on Fluorescein to include in the permit
4. Page 11 – provide additional explanation of the mini injectivity test – which formation will it be conducted on?
5. Page 11 – why “may” the initial FOT be conducted, rather than “shall” be conducted?
6. Page 13 – why is the final FOT deleted?
7. Page 17 – the application (Page 8 – Attachment P) says one well for seismic monitoring, permit now says three – please clarify. Also, need to include correct explanation of monitoring equipment and data to be provided.
8. Page 19 – what is the source of the carbon dioxide?
9. Page 28 – thermal conductivity monitoring – clarify wording of what information will be monitored and reported.
10. Additional Monitoring – if additional monitoring is proposed it should be identified and included in the permit.
11. Page 31 – must provide reports to agencies listed
12. Appendix I – Operation Time line – why deleted?

### Additional questions from permit

1. Attachment L, Page 12 – where is there an existing approved injection well in Rio Vista?
2. Attachment O, Page 1 – who is the Executive Director?
3. Attachment P. Page 8 – are there more details on the proposed 100 foot well for seismic monitoring?